

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheets include changes to Figures 3A-4B. In each of Figures 3A, 3B, 4A, and 4B, a legend of “Prior Art” is added, as requested in the Office Action.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed August 3, 2007, claims 1-5, 8, and 9 were rejected. Additionally, claims 6 and 9 were objected to. Additionally, the specification was objected to. Additionally, the drawings were objected to. In response, Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claims and the below-provided remarks.

For reference, claims 1-11 and 13 are amended. In particular, claim 1 is amended to recite a memory in which the plurality of codes is stored. This amendment is supported, for example, by the original language of claim 6. Claim 1 is also amended to include punctuation and address various other language in the claim. Claims 2-11 and 13 are also amended to include punctuation and address various other language in the claims. Claims 2-5 and 9 are also amended to refer to “The method,” rather than “A method,” in the preamble. Claims 7 and 11 are also amended to refer to “The device,” rather than “A device,” in the preamble.

As a preliminary matter, while the Office Action provides a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter, the Office Action’s statement is directed to specific aspects of certain claims and not necessarily to all of the claims. Applicant notes that the Office Action’s comments may have paraphrased the language of the claims and it should be understood that the language of the claims themselves set out the scope of the claims. Thus, it is noted that the claim language should be viewed in light of the exact language of the claim rather than any paraphrasing or implied limitations thereof. Also, the indicated claims may include other allowable subject matter, in addition to the subject matter referenced in the Office Action.

Objections to the Specification

The specification is object to because it references claims. Applicant submits that the language identified by the Office Action is deleted or amended to remove any reference to specific claim numbers. The specification is also amended to claim a benefit of priority based on the indicated PCT and European patent applications.

The Office Action also suggests that section headings be added to the specification, according to the guidelines set forth in the MPEP. Applicant notes that the suggested section headings are not required and, hence, Applicant respectfully declines to amend the specification to include the indicated section headings.

Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action objected to Figures 3A-4B, stating that these figures should be designated by a legend such as “Prior Art.” Applicant submits that each of Figures 3A, 3B, 4A, and 4B are amended to include a legend, as requested in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claims 6 and 9 were specifically objected to for minor grammatical corrections. Additionally, other claims were objected to based on antecedent language. Applicant submits that the amendments to the claims address all of the objections to the claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-5, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Horowitz et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,142,612, hereinafter Horowitz). However, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over Horowitz for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites “supplying a plurality of codes from a memory in which the plurality of codes is stored, each code comprising a number of code sections that corresponds to the number of transmission lines of the transmission medium, each code section of a code on an associated transmission line having a predetermined signal

value, and the sum of the signal values being substantially constant for each transmitted code” (emphasis added).

The Office Action recognizes that the language of claim 1, as amended, is directed to allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states, in reference to claim 6, that the references of record neither reveal nor render obvious the recited combination of memory, in which a plurality of codes is stored, each code comprising a number of code sections that corresponds to the number of transmission lines of the transmission medium, each code section of a code on an associated transmission line having a predetermine signal value. Claim 1 includes language directed to a memory device in which the plurality of codes is stored, having the characteristics described by the Office Action. Accordingly, while claim 1 may include additional language that is allowable subject matter, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Horowitz at least based on the analysis presented in the Office Action.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 8, and 9

Claims 2-5, 8, and 9 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully asserts claims 2-5, 8, and 9 are allowable based on allowable base claims. Additionally, each of claims 2-5, 8, and 9 may be allowable for further reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: November 5, 2007

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111